



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

is found in the note on v. 125. ἐξεφριμεν is written out ἐξεπαρίμεν, εἰσφρήσω is εἰσπαρήσω, and so of the rest. Nauck's προίημι he does not accept; still less πῖφρημι, *quod nullum fuit*. Brugmann's solution (A. J. P. II 137) he does not mention at all. Assuredly ἐκπαρ-, εἰσπαρ- are harder to swallow in that order than the process by which φερ-, φρε- is assimilated to ἴημι. v. 177 ἐξάγειν δοκῶ doubtless needs correction, but it is simply fetichism to follow Cobet's ἐξαγ' ἐνδοθεν when Elmsley's ἐξάξειν lies so near. v. 231 ἱμᾶς κύνειος assuredly calls for a note, and so does τὰς κάννας, v. 394. ἀρέσκειν with acc. finds no mercy in the eyes of a Dutch uniformitarian, and we are ordered to elide μοι in Aristophanes (v. 776), after the pattern of epic poetry and after the example which Ar. himself has set in οἶμοι. This was to be expected, but it was utterly unexpected to find in van Leeuwen's fluent Latin *per aliquem stare* (Proleg. ix) in a sense against which the *plagosi Orbili* of my boyhood used to warn beginners in Latin composition.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

---

Pindar: the Olympian and Pythian Odes. With Notes Explanatory and Critical, Introductions, and Introductory Essays by C. A. M. FENNELL. New Edition. Cambridge, At the University Press. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1893.

Mr. Fennell's edition of the Olympian and Pythian Odes of Pindar announces itself as a new work, and, though much of the old matter has been retained, the claim is not an idle one. The metres have received considerable attention; the echo theory has been pursued into all its details; and the principle that there must be a symmetry in contents corresponding to the symmetry in form has had a marked effect on the treatment of the structure of the odes. In all these points, however, Mr. Fennell has not only preserved but has been careful to assert his independence. The application of the principle of symmetry has not regularly yielded the results presented in my edition, though the divergences are not startling for the most part. The metrical schemes of the old edition have been abandoned, and the new metric is followed to a certain extent, but Mr. Fennell considers H. Schmidt's results as entirely too definite, and contents himself with recording the various metrical groups as they present themselves to him, and declines to take notice, at least regularly, of such symmetry as his own metrical schemes exhibit. The observation of the responsions has not been favorable to the theories of Mezger and Bury, and the contention of Bulle that there are too many verbal responsions for the catchword theory is confirmed by an almost fatiguing cumulation of examples. Words recurring in exactly the same position as regards metre, or, as Mr. Fennell calls them, 'tautometric' words, he considers, as a rule, to be without significance, whereas an obviously significant repetition is generally 'heterometric,' unless more than one word is recalled. At the same time, no explanation of the undeniable frequency of these repetitions is given beyond vague surmises.

In criticism and exegesis Mr. Fennell does not seem to have troubled himself much about the work that lies scattered through journals and dissertations, and one can imagine the rage of Bornemann when he finds that all

his Pindaric articles, including his marvellous reconstruction of Pythia VI (Philol. LI 465), have been left unnoticed. Granted that much of this literature is naught, still Mr. Fennell's edition is considered by his countrymen to be something more than a mere introduction to Pindar, and he cannot afford to pass over matters that a school edition might be excused for failing to notice. So, for instance, in the vexed passage O 6, 15 he proposes, evidently with great satisfaction, *τε δαισθέντων* as a conjecture of his own, but that conjecture was made long ago by van Herwerden (Jahrb., XIII Suppl. Band, p. 10), and will be found in the last impression of my edition, with a parallel passage, not from Euripides, but from Pindar himself (N 9, 29). I might point out further that in O 10, 21, *διαλλάξαντο*, the gnomic aor., which relieves the situation entirely, has been suggested by a number of scholars—Lehrs, Schroeder, Wilamowitz (see A. J. P. XII 386)—but as every potential optative is a comfort to Mr. Fennell, I forbear. The notes, as in so many English editions, seem to have been prepared not so much to help the student as to emphasize those points where the editor has special views to advocate or special antagonists to rap. But, if Mr. Fennell has not been over-liberal in his notes, he has tried to make up for that deficiency by long stretches of translation, though it must be said that his renderings keep so close to the text that they are generally quite as obscure as the original. Many of the old notes have been retained unaltered, many have been abridged, and the space thus gained is largely occupied by criticisms of other editions, sometimes with, more frequently without, the mention of the sinners' names. My own share of the punishment I am disposed to take in perfectly good part, though I have here and there been tempted to exclaim 'Ne sis mihi tutor'; for in many, if not most, of the points mentioned the individual judgment of the editor must be respected and 'Beware' and 'Do not' are entirely out of place. The men who made the Xanthus of O 8, 47 the river of Troy and not, as the scholiast has it, the city of Lycia, are among the best commentators of Pindar, whom it is no shame to follow. Nor is a point of grammar settled by classing such a man as Bergk among the unsympathetic editors (P 4, 268), and he who prefers to consider the *ἀελπτία βαλὼν* of P 12, 31, not as the *dativus termini*, for which there is scant warrant in Pindar, but as the dative of the instrument, might invoke Pindar's own words: *μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος* (O 8, 55). In treating of *ἐπί* Mr. Fennell makes a point of rejecting my interpretation of the passages in which I prefer the more plastic notion of superposition to the more prosaic metaphorical renderings (cf. O 2, 12), just as in dealing with a poet I have not hesitated to revive the local notion that lies at the bottom of *καθορᾶν* (P 9, 53). Mr. Fennell may be right in both these points, but a ukase will not do away with the thesis that 'the sharp, local sense of the preposition is everywhere to be preferred' in Pindar.

Another matter of taste, in which it is impossible to lay down laws, is the translation of the opt. with *ὄν*. If the protasis is expressed or lies very near, then the rendering is fairly uniform. But if it is a potential, we have a wide range. The negative is regularly 'cannot,' the positive is often 'must,' not *ἀνάγκη*, not *δεῖ*, but simply the expression of moral assurance. So *οὐκ ἂν ἐμὸς εἴη* (Hdt. 6, 63) 'he can't be mine,' *εἴησαν ἂν οὗτοι Κρήτες* (Hdt. 1, 2) 'these must be or must have been Cretans'—to cite two familiar examples (see my

Just. Martyr Apol. I 4, 10). Comp. Plat. Apol. 28 C: φαῦλοι γὰρ ἂν τῷ γε σὺ λόγῳ εἴεν, *They must be, must have been, sorry fellows, according to your account*, and for the periphrastic perf. opt. with ἂν Legg. 678 E, 753 E, 782 A, 880 E, 896 C and 896 D, the last of which passages is actually echoed by ἀνάγκη. And so I am not quite convinced that 'must come, cannot fail to come' for γένοιτ' ἂν (O 2, 20) is so utterly indefensible. The opt. with ἂν is constantly used as a warmer future, and the context shows that the result is a certainty:

λάβα δὲ πτόμῳ σὺν εἰδαίμονι γένοιτ' ἂν.  
 ἐσλὼν γὰρ ὑπὸ χαρμάτων πῆμα θνήσκει  
 παλίγκτον δαμασθέν.

Still, if any one prefers 'well may come,' I shall make no objection.

In my Introductory Essay I said: "The middle is no more causative than the active" (ci), a remark which may have been due to Mr. Fennell's favorite explanation of the middle as causative, and in O 5, 8 I was indiscreet enough to call ἐκάρνυξε causative, and Mr. Fennell forthwith reminds me that it is not grammatically causative. The warning is doubtless well meant, but I wish Mr. Fennell had gone on to say that the causative use of both active and middle is extra-grammatical. Not so the reciprocal use of the middle, which Mr. Fennell cannot bring himself to recognize. The curious note of the first ed. on O 1, 95: ταχυντὰς ποδῶν ἐρίζεται, has disappeared, it is true, but instead of giving ἐρίζεται the reciprocal force that we find in μάχεται and the whole group, he contents himself with saying that ἐρίζεται is used in the same sense as the active, which is never very safe doctrine.

The 'short' subjunctive Mr. Fennell does not accept for Pindar, and in ὄφρα βάσομεν (O 6, 23 f.) he considers βάσομεν a future, for which he cites two passages from Homer, and not three, as I have done, and cites both of them incorrectly. Read Od. 4, 163 and 17, 6 f. In the same ode, v. 44, κνίζομένα I ventured to refer to the familiar passage in Plato's Theaetetus, 151 C, in which young mothers 'wax savage about their babies,' when they are taken away from them, and though the situation of Euadne, who is forced to leave her child, is not absolutely parallel, is the passage after all 'quite irrelevant and the idea utterly out of place'? Is it really an ἀνεμαῖον of mine or a *sic volo* of Mr. Fennell's?

O 8, 86 νέμεσιν διχόβουλον is rendered 'envy that divideth counsels,' which Mr. Fennell elicits from 'envy of divided counsels,' just as he elicits 'purifying' from καθαροῦ λέβητος of O 1, 26. The personification is stoutly impugned. "To pray that Zeus should not make Nemesis of divided mind would be equivalent to praying that Zeus should make Nemesis inflexible, which was unnecessary, or inflexible in bestowing blessings, which is not her function." Is there not a little too much *raison démonstrative* about this for the interpretation of poetry? To pray that the Goddess of Award should not be of divided counsels is to pray that she should always have a clear case in favor of the suppliants, ἀμφὶ καλῶν μοῖρα. Mr. Fennell repeatedly warns against over-analysis. If we were to analyze P 10, 43 f. as closely as he has analyzed this passage, we should elicit a joke out of φηγόντες—Νέμεσιν (= Ἀδράστειαν). For making νέμεσιν mere envy Mr. Fennell has, it is true, the support of that 'unsympathetic editor' Bergk. But whatever becomes of διχόβουλον, I must ask, as Gurlitt asked more than eighty years ago, 'Wie kann nun Nemesis hier bloß Neid bezeichnen?'

The only passage in which Mr. Fennell attacks my English is in his note on O 11 73 (81), *παραιθυζε*, and for this generosity I am duly grateful. One of my English critics said that my style was not very scholarly, but failed to particularize; another found fault with my use of 'aloofness,' but that was before the publication of AL in the Oxford Dictionary; another thought 'saliency' a horrid word,<sup>1</sup> and a chorus of indolent reviewers lifted up their ineffectual heels against the expression (Introductory Essay, xxxiii) 'an arrangement in God and Blood.' Was I to refer in a footnote to Mrs. Waterbrook in David Copperfield and to inform the world that I purposely made my phrase as crude as Pindar's youthful creed? So here Mr. Fennell tells me that 'flashing sound' is un-English. For that matter, *παραιθυζε* as Pindar uses it is un-Greek, and by 'flashing sound' I intended to indicate the unwonted transfer from sight to sound. And after all, is 'flashing sound' any more unjustifiable than 'flashes of silence'—a *mot* that was successful in its day?

But I do not care to follow Mr. Fennell through all the passages—there are some scores—in which he arraigns the interpretations that I have accepted from others or haply struck out for myself. A reply to criticisms is apt to be sharper than the criticisms themselves, and what scholarly criticisms are, we can learn from Mr. Fennell himself. "The ill-natured criticisms and controversies of athletes," says Mr. Fennell in his Introduction to Ol. IX, "are now endless and probably have always been so. Scholarship, however, cannot in this particular vaunt itself over gymnastic." Perhaps there is a twinge of repentance discernible in this passing remark. At all events, I will not let Mr. Fennell's somewhat blunt expression of differences in details of interpretation interfere with my satisfaction at his approval of my general treatment of Pindaric composition; and in my hearty recognition of the services rendered to the study of Pindar by this new edition, to which I hope to return, I shall not be disturbed by the epithets 'idle,' 'rash,' 'fanciful,' 'far-fetched' and 'unsound' which he has bestowed on my exegesis. He who hears nothing worse from his brethren of the philological guild may count himself lucky. *θεὸς εἰη ἀπήμων κέαρ*, says the youthful Pindar, with an optative he might have learned from Hesiod. *ἐν δ' ὀλίγῳ βροτῶν τὸ τεργνὸν αὔξεται*, says Pindar, the aged.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

---

Der deutsche Satzbau, dargestellt von HERMANN WUNDERLICH. Stuttgart, 1892.

Believing that science ought, from time to time, to give an account of its progress to the general public, the author attempts a practical application of the latest detailed work in Germanics, in which he deals primarily with the sentence-structure of the modern period of the German language. He certainly deserves to be commended for his observance of the element of proportion, in keeping his historical foundation visible merely, instead of building it up so high as to be mistaken for the edifice itself. The student of German will realize that a work such as the one before us, however well

<sup>1</sup>"[The] pungent sayings [of W. H. Thompson] acquired their fame as much from the prominence of his position as from their own *saliency*."—C. Merivale in [English] *Journal of Philology*, XV 307.